



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,597	07/18/2003	Donald David Karlov	MSFT-1794/303770.1	4306
41505	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			MONESTIME, MACKLY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,597

Applicant(s)

KARLOV, DONALD DAVID

Examiner

Mackly Monestime

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/11/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. As per claim 8, line 1 recites the limitation "**said portrait oriented graphic**".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

Line 2 recites the limitation "**a secondary portrait mode**", the examiner is not clearly understood what applicant is referring to by stating a secondary portrait mode, since claims 1-7 did not mention a primary portrait mode; therefore, this claim language is vague and indefinite.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

Art Unit: 2676

351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoppe et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0196256).

7. As per claims 1, 13-14, 21 and 28 Hoppe et al substantially disclosed the invention as claimed, including a method for rendering graphics on a display device for a computer system having a central processing unit, (Fig. 2, Item No. 202) system random access memory, and a graphics card (Fig. 2, Item No. 204 and 206), said graphics card comprising a graphical processing unit, video random access memory, and a frame buffer (Fig. 2, GPU; 208 video memory; and 204), said method comprising: rendering a graphic in the system random access memory with the central processing unit (Fig. 2, Item No. 202, 204) and copying said graphic from the system random access memory to the frame buffer (Fig. 2, Items No. 204 and 208; page 3, paragraph 0040, lines 1-5).

8. As per claims 2 and 23, Hoppe et al disclosed that graphic comprises a complex graphic element (page 2, paragraph 0020, lines 1-6).

9. As per claims 3-4, 15-16 and 24, Hoppe et al disclosed that graphic comprises a sub-pixel manipulation and anti-aliasing (page 1, paragraph 0006, lines 1-4).

10. As per claims 5-7, 17-19, Hoppe et al disclosed that graphic comprises shading, texturing and alpha-blending (page 4, paragraph 0060).

11. As per claims 8, 20, Hoppe et al disclosed that said portrait oriented graphic is displayed on the display device in a secondary portrait mode (page 5, paragraph 0078).

Art Unit: 2676

12. As per claim 9 and 21, Hoppe et al disclosed that complex graphic comprises a compositing of overlays (page 3, paragraph 0042).

13. As per claims 10 and 25, Hoppe et al disclosed wherein said computer system further comprises an accelerated graphics port (ACP) between the central processing unit, the system random access memory, and the graphics card (page 3, paragraph 0035, lines 1-15).

14. As per claims 11-12 and 26-27, Hoppe et al disclosed that the graphics card comprises a graphics accelerator, graphics coprocessor (Fig. 2, Item No. 206).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Migdal et al (US Patent No. 6,392,655) taught a fine grain multi-pass for multiple texture rendering.

Whelan et al (US Pub. No. 2004/0199798) taught a low power display refresh.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mackly Monestime whose telephone number is (703) 305-3855. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bella Matthew, can be reached on (703) 308-6829.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Art Unit: 2676

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,


Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Mackly Monestime

  
Patent Examiner

January 31, 2005



MATTHEW C. BELLA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600